

#2 / IDS  
E. Small  
9-22-95

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	)	
GILBERT P. HYATT	)	Group Art Unit: Not yet assigned
Serial No. Not yet assigned	)	Examiner: Not yet assigned
Docket No. 751	)	
Filed: Not yet assigned	)	
For: IMPROVED IMAGE PROCESSING	)	
ARCHITECTURE	)	

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT  
UNDER 37 CFR 1.97 AND CFR 1.98

Hon. Assistant Commissioner  
For Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
Sir:

The Examiner is requested to take notice of the prosecution and appeal in the file histories of the ancestor applications.

A LIST OF ART CITED BY APPLICANT is transmitted herewith in full compliance with MPEP 609. Each of the listed references was cited in an ancestor application. A copy of each reference and an explanation of relevance was provided in the ancestor applications. For example, in ancestor application S/N 07/289,355; the examiner therein cited 12 of these patents, the applicant cited the rest of these patents, and the applicant provided copies of the rest of these patents with the papers filed on or about March 22, 1991. The applicant pointed out therein that most of the rest of these references were cited by the examiners in ancestor applications. All of these references are related to display systems and memory systems and hence are directly relevant to the instant application.

MPEP 609 establishes that, in this particular case, copies of the art from the ancestor applications is not required.

"Where the applicant has submitted copies of prior art in accordance with these guidelines in a prior application or the Office has cited the prior art in applicant's prior application, reference to the

submission in the prior application will be sufficient  
for the continuing application as far as the copies are  
concerned." [emphasis added] (MPEP 609).

Hence, in the present continuing application; there is no need  
for the Applicant to provide such copies.

MPEP 609 further establishes that, in this particular case,  
another discussion of relevance is not required.


"As far as the statement per se is concerned, the  
relevance of the prior art to the claimed subject  
matter must be indicated if it differs from its  
relevance as explained in the prior application."  
[emphasis added] (MPEP 609).

Because the relevance does not differ, such a statement is not  
required.

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL: I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with Express Mail post office to  
addressee service under 37 CFR 1.10, postage prepaid, in a package addressed to the Assistant  
Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 with the express mail label number HB-105-850-272  
on the date set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 5, 1995

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gilbert P. Hyatt  
Registration No. 27,647  
P.O. Box 81230  
Las Vegas, NV 89180  
Phone (702) 871-9899